DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 293 870 TM 011 455

AUTHOR Bredeson, Paul V.
TITLE The Use of Application Blanks in Public School Districts: An Assessment of Legal Compliance and Equity Issues.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 22p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Civil Rights; Civil Rights Legislation; Compliance (Legal); Elementary Secondary Education; *Employment Practices; Employment Qualifications; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Job Application; Occupational Information; *Personnel Selection; *Public Schools; *School Districts
IDENTIFIERS Equal Employment Opportunity Act 1972

ABSTRACT

Application blanks being used as pre-employment screening selection devices in public schools were studied to determine compliance with federal legislative guidelines (i.e., the 1972 Equal Employment Opportunities Act) and to assess personnel selection activities. Over 200 application blanks from 65 school districts from northeastern states were coded and classified. Remnants of bias were found in the standardized application blanks. Illegal requests for background information violating equal employment opportunity guidelines were found in 51.7% of the professional and 59.7% of the non-professional application blanks. A sex bias was not readily apparent in this sample of application blanks. Relevance of the data collected should be the major criterion in designing application blanks. Compliance with guidelines to avoid discrimination is necessary. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED293870

THE USE OF APPLICATION BLANKS IN PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS:

AN ASSESSMENT OF LEGAL COMPLIANCE AND EQUITY ISSUES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paul V. Bredeson, Associate Professor

The Pennsylvania State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

PAUL V. BREDESON

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INTRODUCTION

Among the most critical factors which have been listed as imperative for the attainment of educational excellence in public schools are the recruitment and selection of the most capable candidates to fill a steady stream of vacancies. Based on current demographic statistics, projections for the professional education work force, and the college educated cohort group, public education is beginning to experience what Willis D. Hawley (1986) describes as a crisis of historic proportions in the shortage of teachers as well as administrative and support personnel. Within this context, it is crucial that school administrators assess the decision making processes and the types of information sources they rely on for the selection of personnel in their districts. As Harris, McIntyre, Littleton, and Long (1985) state, "Unless systematic efforts are made to record factors underlying selection decisions and to relate these data to subsequent observations of performance, it is unlikely that improvements will ever be made in the selection process" (p. 116-117).

Across the United States there are 15,398 operating public school districts which employ over 5.3 million FTE (full time equivalent) professional and support staff. It is important to note that this total represents somewhat less than the actual number of individuals who hold positions since many school employees, especially non-professional support staff, are in part-time positions. Of this total, there are 223,667 district-wide professional employees (administrators and central

TM 011 455

office personnel), approximately 2.8 million school staff. This total includes 2.1 million classroom teachers, 123,204 building administrators, 163,692 school and library support staff, 285,651 instructional aides, 63,312 guidance counselors, and 46,979 librarians. In addition, there are some 899,290 other service and support staff as well as 1.4 million non-professionals in food service, maintenance, and transportation (Digest of Educational Statistics 1985-86).

In the press to be more selective and to place only the most able candidates in professional and non-professional positions in public schools, it is equally important to ensure that selection activities and processes are equitable and legal. The selection process, uniquely designed to meet the needs and resources of individual school districts, typically includes a variety of activities ranging from initial collection of written information to final interviews and decisions to hire. One activity is the use of application blanks to gather basic information about a candidate's background and related experiences. Until the early 1970's schools districts as employers were free to ask for whatever information they wanted regardless of its relation to an individual's ability to perform effectively in the position (Harris, et al., 1985). In 1972 the Equal Employment Opportunities Act was passed. This legislation as well as the Civil Rights Act 1964, and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act prohibit the use by school districts of any personnel selection practices and materials (application blanks included) which are discriminatory against women, minorities, or any protected classification of people.

The research reported in this paper was an attempt to assess systematically the application blanks currently being used as pre-screening selection devices in public schools. This investigation was done not only to record compliance with federal legislative guidelines but also with the expectation that knowledge of illegal practices and/or questionable sources and types of information would be a basis for critical assessment and improvement of all personnel selection activities in public schools. Specifically, the following questions guided the investigation: What basic candidate information is requested on application blanks currently being used in public school districts? What does the research indicate about the predictive validity and practical utility

of types of information being solicited on these application blanks? Are there any violations of the E.E.O. Act of 1972? Are there significant differences between the types of basic information (permissible versus prohibited) requested of professional applicants (teachers and administrators) and of support staff personnel (secretaries, food service workers, bus drivers, and maintenance workers)? Are there significant differences in the types of basic information requested of applicants for positions typically filled by women (secretaries, food service employees, and instructional aides) and those generally held by men (custodians, bus drivers, and maintenance personnel)?

BACKGROUND

There is a large body of literature and empirical research specifically focused on personnel selection processes in schools. The foundations of this line of inquiry are built on research done in psychology and in business and industry. Extensive summaries of findings from this research have been written by Arvey and Campion (1982), Mayfield (1964), Schmitt (1976), Wagner (1949), Wright (1969), and Young and Ryerson (1986). One criticism of many of the empirical studies cited in these summaries is that many of the experimental studies, which employ sophisticated designs and rigorous techniques for data analysis, are plagued by problems of validity and connection to real world selection processes and results (Gorman, Clover, and Doherty, 1978). In response to this criticism, the investigation reported in this paper was an attempt to examine real documents and selection processes currently used in public schools.

The application blank is an important selection tool for collecting standardized biographical information on candidates during initial paper screening activities. Historically, use of a standardized form to improve selection of employees dates from its use in the insurance industry in the late 19th century (Ferguson, 1961). Many of the early studies were attempts to assess systematically the biodata instruments, which were seen as extensions of the application blank itself. Studies by Keating, Paterson, and Stone (1950) and by Mosel and Cozan (1952)

reported that correlations between information provided by the applicant and that obtained from previous employees were very high. More recently the use of standardized instruments to collect candidate biographical data has been an attempt to secure objective and scorable items of autobiographical information which are weighted and subsequently used for predictive, diagnostic and/or counseling purposes. These more or less standardized forms appear as Biographical Information Blanks (BIB), Biographical Data Forms, Application blanks, Interview Guides, and Individual Background Surveys. "Guion (1965) extended use of the Weighted Application Blank WAB as an empirical keying method for scoring and combining biographical data" (Anastasi, 1979; and Cascio, 1978). Research on pre-screening activities and the evaluation of candidates for employment has focused on biodata and its stability and validity as a good criterion predictor of future candidate performance. The use of biodata items, whether standardized on instruments or more loosely gathered on application blanks, "has both intuitive and intrinsic validity probably based on the fact that it speaks directly to a central measurement axiom; namely, that what a man *will do* in the future is best predicted from what he *has done* in the past" (Owens, I976).

Though little empirical research has been done in the field of education, the underlying reasons for using structured applications blanks for professional and nonprofessional vacancies in public schools mirror those from other areas. Three general ideas support the use of data related to the assessment of past accomplishments, and performance records of individuals as secured in application blanks: I.) past behavior is the best indicator of future behavior; 2.) 'samples' of past behavior are preferable to 'signs'; and, 3.) biodata are samples of past behavior and are the best indicators of future behaviors (Hough, 1984). Neiner and Owens (1982) reported in their investigations of the utility of biodata that, "The results support past behavior as being a good predictor of future behavior. Although the findings are modest, they suggest that relevant biodata on individuals may reveal unique patterns of past experience that significantly related to

future behavior. In this light, biodata may indeed be regarded as providing a postmortem view of the development of an individual" (p. 150).

Generally, standardized application blanks solicit biographic data on a candidate's background and related experiences. As a selection tool, the application blank is efficient, robust, and highly valid as a predictor of a broad spectrum of very practical criteria. In addition, the standard application blank has a high degree of face validity for employees and employers. Research summaries indicate reliability coefficients ranging from .87 to .97 for application blanks. Validity coefficients are in the moderate range .40 to .50. There are practical advantages as well. Application blanks provide a low cost means of gathering biographical data, previous job experiences, and educational background, and a variety of personal information that would otherwise be impossible or impractical to collect on individuals. Application blanks can be used to ask candidates for personal and professional goals and philosophy, as well as to solicit self-assessments. As self-report instruments, the accuracy of information reported tends to be stable over time and not heavily influenced by response styles, social desirability, and acquiescence, which tend to lower validity (Shaffer, Saunders, & Owens, 1986). When used as a primary paper screening device, the rating of particular relevant items generally can be objectively coded which accounts for high inter-rater reliability (Owens, 1976).

Research on use of application blanks per se has been limited. Two recent investigations (Stone and Stone, 1987; and Bredeson and Caldwell, 1988) provide important analyses of candidate strategies for completing information requests and of application blanks themselves. Stone and Stone investigated the effects of information management strategy (leaving items blank dealing with criminal conviction record), race, and job type. They found that job applicants who chose to leave items blank on a application, that they viewed as irrelevant or that were unfairly invasive of their privacy, suffered the consequences of lower ratings by employers who suspected that the candidates were attempting to conceal facts that would reflect poorly on themselves. Main effects were reported for information management strategy and job type but not

for race. "Put simply, refusing to respond to items does not appear to be a viable strategy for applicants in protecting their actual or desired rights to privacy" (p. 455)..

In another investigation, Bredeson and Caldwell (l988) reported the results of an analysis of legal compliance by public school districts in the use of application blanks in a large northeastern state. They found that 45.7 percent of respondent districts were using application blanks for professional positions which contained from one to as many as nine specific requests for information which were violations of EEOC guidelines. For staff positions, 62.3 percent of the districts used applications blanks requesting prohibited information in pre-selection screening activities. Significant differences were reported between between professional and nonprofessional application blanks and those that contained assurances of EEOC compliance and those that did not in terms of the presence of requests for prohibited biographical information on application blanks.

METHODOLOGY

To address the major research questions, a letter, requesting copies of applications blanks currently used in the school district for professional and support staff positions, was sent to 25 randomly selected public school districts in each of four northeastern states. After one month a second request was sent to non-respondents. A third letter was sent to any remaining nonrespondent districts after two months. Two hundred and two application blanks were returned from 65 school districts,which represented a 60 to 72 percent return rate from the four states. Though non-responses are always a threat to the generalizability of reported results, the investigator considered the 65% overall response rate and the total number of documents returned (202) as acceptable for gathering descriptive data on initial information gathering processes and materials used in these four states and for testing the major hypotheses.

The application blanks were coded by indication of the type of position. Of the 202 documents, only (1l) 5.4 percent were classified as generic applications; that is, the same

application blank was used for all vacancies in the districts regardless if those openings were professional or nonprofessional. The majority of applications differentiated between positions: nonprofessional support staff (93) 46.0 percent; teacher (27) l3.4 percent; non-teaching professional staff such as psychologists and curriculum specialists (ll) 5.4 percent); administrators (13) 6.4 percent; substitute teachers (16) 7.9 percent; teacher or administrator (18) 8.9 percent, the remainder of application types were combinations of the above categories and accounted for 6.4 percent of the documents. Subsequent collapsing of these categories yielded three major groupings of documents--nonprofessional support staff (93) 46.0 percent, professional staff (98) 48.5, and general (8)4.0 percent. Three districts did not use application blanks for professional or for non-professional vacancies.

FINDINGS

Once the application blanks were coded and classified each was analyzed by the researcher. Two instruments were developed to record nominal counts of the presence or absence of two major categories of data: the first was a check-off list of 2l items of information which according to EEOC guidelines school districts are prohibited from collecting in personnel search and selection activities; the second instrument was used to record the categories of information requested on professional application blanks only. The findings will be discussed in four sections. The first is a narrative description of the types, forms and quality of the application blanks themselves; the second is a presentation of the major types of candidate information requested from teaching and administrative applicants; next any requests for information which were in violation of EEOC guidelines be will presented; and finally, the data related to the three hypotheses tested will be reported.

If, as this researcher believes, the materials that a school district uses to collect candidate information are also tools for communicating important information about the district to prospective employees, professional and nonprofessional, the range of messages communicated from these

public school districts falls on a continuum from depressing to dynamic. For support staff positions, districts typically required just the completion of the application itself. Supplemental materials were rarely required except perhaps for a bus driver's position, in which case the applicant would need proof that he/she possessed a current operator's license in the state. For professional positions, application blanks were only one piece of applicant information. A cover letter, resume, college placement file, official transcripts, letters of recommendation, and a statement of educational philosophy typically complemented the professional applicant's file.

Based on an initial assessment of the actual application documents, there appears to be a slightly greater need to differentiate application types for nonprofessional support staff positions than for professional vacancies. The variety of non-professional application forms might suggest that districts were fine tuning their application blanks to better assess applicants for various nonprofessional vacancies, however, the variations consisted mainly of a few minor changes in items related to the specific job, a new heading at the top of a standard form, and/or occasional color coding. Though the differentiation among application blanks was primarily cosmetic, it is interesting that districts believed that there was a greater need to differentiate among nonprofessional positions whereas most districts used a more general application form for staff professionals- teachers, administrators, and other professional employees such as librarians, counselors, business managers, and curriculum supervisors. This may be due in part to the fact that the job types and the applicants and their backgrounds have much greater variability for non-professionals than for professionals and to the greater comprehensiveness of informational sources for professional applicants.

From the applicants' point of view, the application forms they received were revealing products which many times subtlely and in other cases blatantly pointed out important messages and differences among districts. At the extremes of the continuum were high quality, professionally prepared application blanks which clearly indicated that the district was knowledgeable about EEOC guidelines, used a full range of standardized questions and

informational categories to solicit valuable predictive data from candidates, and the application itself provided important information about the district, e.g. district goals and educational philosophy to the candidate. At the other end of the continuum were poorly duplicated forms (sometimes yellowed, some hardly readable dittos) with few relevant categories of requests for candidate information related to job qualfications, requests which lacked specificity as to exactly what information was necessary, and forms with numerous items which were clearly illegal requests for background information on candidates.

From the 202 application blanks, a subset of 78 documents which were used only for teachers, admnistrators and other professionals was analyzed. What is it school districts wanted to know about teacher and administrator candidates? Using a checklist with six major categories of information (personal data, current professional status, educational background, educational work experiences, other work experiences, open-ended questions which required reflective and/or projective responses from the candidate, and requests for additional candidate information), what becomes immediately apparent is that the information requested of candidates was little more than a bare-bones listing of "the facts, just the facts". Generalizing from this data set one would be forced to conclude that the utility of the application blank is based on a recording of candidate name, address, telephone, certificate held, current position and employer, teaching experience, degree(s) held, and the names of references. As a composite of possibilities for gathering candidate background information, few of the reporting districts currently take advantage of the breadth or depth of applicant data available to them in a standardized reporting form over which the district has complete control. Though personnel decision makers have multiple sources of teacher/administrator background data, these data are likely to be less uniformly reported among candidates because the districts have little to no control over the type or format of information in other written documents such as resumes, transcripts, placement files, and letters of recommendation. As a result, attempts to code and evaluate comparative data on candidates objectively is difficult.

A second checklist was used to record whether or not the application blanks contained requests for candidate background which were violations of EEOC guidelines. Analysis of the 202 documents revealed that 51.7 percent of the respondent districts used application materials that contained EOE assurances. With or without such assurances, 51.6 percent of the respondent districts are currently using employee application blanks for professional positions which contain from one to as many as nine specific requests which are illegal. For nonprofessional positions, 59.7 percent of the districts are using applications containing such violations. Table 1 is a comparative listing of the most common requests which are violations of EEOC guidelines. Across all applications, the most frequent requests for prohibited information are-- birthdate/age (32.2 percent), general physical condition (24.8 percent), marital status (19.3 percent), weight and height (17.3 percent), handicaps (12.9 percent), number of dependents (12.9 percent), birthplace (10.9 percent), citizenship (9.4 percent), and maiden nameand sex (7.4 percent). Contrasting application blanks for professional versus those for nonprofessional, there is no difference in terms of EOE assurances. However, the percent of violations contained on nonprofessional application blanks is noticeably greater for items requesting information about number of dependents, weight and height, general physical condition, handicaps and birthplace.

The nominal counts of illegal requests provided a measure for testing three major hypotheses:

I. The application blanks for nonprofessional(support staff positions) would contain significantly greater violations than those application blanks for professional positions.

TABLE 1

Summary Of Illegal Inquiries By Percent Of Appearance On Application Blanks

Prohibited Inquiry	All Applications N=202	Applications for Professional Positions N=96	Applications for Non-Professional Positions N=93
Maiden Name	7.4	8.3	5.4
Sex	7.4	9.4	6.5
Marital Status	19.2	20.8	19.4
Number of Dependents	12.8	9.4	17.2
Age	32.0	28.1	37.6
Height	17.2	13.5	21.5
Weight	17.2	13.5	21.5
Physical health condition	24.6	17.7	33.3
Handicaps	12.8	10.4	16.1
Birthplace	10.8	6.3	17.2
Citizenship	9.4	8.3	11.8

2. Application blanks containing assurances that the district was in compliance with EEOC guidelines would have significantly fewer violations for both professional and support staff positions than those application blanks which did not contain such assurances.

3. Application blanks for nonprofessional positions traditionally held by females (clerical, instructional aide, and food service employee) would contain more violations than applications for nonprofessional staff positions typically held by males (bus drivers, custodians, and maintenance employees).

Tests of the hypotheses revealed that application blanks for nonprofessional/support staff positions contained significantly more violations than those application blanks for professional positions (X_1^2= 12.42 p=.0004). The second hypothesis was supported for nonprofessionals but not for professionals. The tests indicated that those districts that used application materials with EOE assurances had significantly fewer violations than those that did not for nonprofessional/support staff (X_3^2 = 13.05 p=.0003). There was no significant difference for professionals (X_2^2 = .00 p=.99). Finally, there was no significant difference between the number of violations contained on applications for nonprofessional positions traditionally held by females and those applications for positions typically held by males (X_4^2 = .93 p=.33).

DISCUSSION

The findings suggest two major areas for discussion. The first relates to legal compliance with EEOC guidelines for nondiscriminatory practices in pre-screening selection activities. The second is one of information relevancy. In terms of the nominal descriptive data, the findings indicate historic remnants of bias, intentional or not, in the use of standardized application blanks in public school employment. With 51.6 percent of the reporting districts using application blanks for professionals with illegal requests for background and 59.7 percent of nonprofessional application blanks containing anywhere from one to nine specific requests which violate EEOC guidelines, clearly there is a need for bringing these materials into compliance with federal laws.

The violations indicated in these data may be quite unintentional on the part of school districts. In many cases, it is quite likely that application materials have not been carefully scrutinized for illegal queries. It may also be the case that in attempts to compress personnel selection activities and to economize personnel data collection procedures, school officials unintentionally gather illegal candidate information much of which is permissible to collect post-hiring for insurance and state and federal reports. Besides the ethical dimensions of such practices, school administrators are responsible for selection practices which are non-discriminatory and which meet legal guidelines so that they do not become defendants in discrimination suits. School officials must be continually sensitive to possible sources of bias in all phases of personnel selection. Though one could argue that the use of application blanks is only a minor part of data collection on candidates, it is one that is completely under the control of the school district. School districts can easily bring the application forms they use into legal compliance. Additionally, assessment of this one measure is a means for heightening awareness of other potential sources of bias in various phases of employee selection. As Bredeson and Caldwell point out, "Employers need to be aware of potential biasing and discriminatory effects of these data. Information provided in application blanks and in other intitial screening activities becomes part of a descriptive and evaluative profiles of prospective candidates as they progress through subsequent phases of the selection process" (1988, p. 85). Discriminatory information and illegal requests for candidate background data which have little or no job relevancy clearly have the potential to thwart EOE guidelines as well as desired personnel outcomes.

The findings reported here support earlier findings by Bredeson et al.(1988) in a study of public school districts in a large northeastern state. Based on these data, further investigation into application blanks currently used in school districts is warranted. The data from these five states suggest that it is important to determine if comparable pre-screening application materials with various illegal inquiries are being used in the 15,398 public school districts across the nation.

Tests of the major hypotheses provide several useful insights for further consideration. More violations were recorded on application materials used for nonprofessional/support personnel than for professional positions. It is likely that greater scrutiny of professional working conditions and contractual agreements through collective bargaining accounts for part of the differences cited. This finding is problematic is two ways. The first is one of legality and the second relates to utility and validity of candidate background information. Since nonprofessional candidates typically do not submit supplemental data to employers, the application blank becomes the major source of applicant information. Given that reality, it is important that the application be in compliance with EEOC guidelines and that it solicits relevant and useful information for employers.

The test of the second hypothesis suggests several interesting points. The fact that there was no significant difference in the number of violations recorded for professional applications between those application blanks that contained EOE assurances and those that did not indicates that EOE written assurances may be nothing more than paper compliance gestures. Application materials which guarantee equal employment opportunity to all applicants and then go on to solicit illegal information send contradictory messages to candidates. As the findings indicate, just because the school district has included EOE assurances on its materials is no reason to believe that these guarantees have been internalized in employee selection practices.

There was no significant difference in the number of violations recorded for application blanks specific to nonprofessional positions for females versus those for males. The small number of application blanks that could be exclusively categorized as clerical/instructional aide/food service (n=28) and janitor/maintenance etc. (n=20), was a problem. Less than half of the school districts made exclusive distinctions between nonprofessional positions related to positions traditionally held by males and those typically filled by females. Though the third hypothesis was not supported, information about maiden name, marital status, number of dependents, age, weight, and height were noted. A larger sample of application blanks is

needed to examine whether or not there is a sex bias in application materials for nonprofessional employees.

A number of districts were cognizant of EOE guidelines and attempted to protect themselves and the candidate from providing background information which could not legally be solicited. Application materials from several districts indicated that the applicant did not have to complete the items such as age, sex, birthdate, marital status, height and weight, and marital status. This may appear to be a simple matter and such options are clearly within the parameters of EEOC guidelines. However, as Stone and Stone (1987) point out in their investigation of applicant strategies for protecting their actual or desired rights to privacy, "A potential employer views a nonresponse to an application-blank item as an attempt to conceal facts that would reflect poorly on an applicant" (p. 455). Though their study used highly toxic data (missing information related to criminal convictions) they call for, "Research that examines how missing information on application blanks affects actual personnel decisions. This research should consider the nature of information that is omitted (e.g. arrest, medical, sex, national origin)" (p. 456). Thus, the impact of a candidate's decision not to respond to application blank items which are optional or clearly prohibited, needs to be investigated.

It is important that school districts bring their application materials into full compliance with the law. Based on the nature of positions, professional and nonprofessional in schools, it is unlikely that items dealing with sex, height, and weight would ever be permissible or useful. Only if a case can be made that this information is important in establishing bona fide occupational qualifications can it be required of candidates. Information on marital status, birthplace, maiden name, spouse and number of dependents are not permissible queries. Age and physical condition are major areas of interest to employers. In terms of age, persons from age 40 to 65 are protected from age discrimination and therefore prohibited inquiries. The only permissible inquiry related to age is to ask if the applicant is over 18 years of age or a given age for being eligible for a license or certificate to do the job. General inquiries about an applicant's physical condition or

handicaps where no particular physical attributes are required to successfully perform the job are prohibited. It is permissible, however, to ask if the applicant has any physical limitations requiring job accommodation or conditions that would not permit him/her to perform the requirements for that position. Statements by employer that a job offer may be contingent upon passing a physical examination or prescribed health certification are also permissible. Whether on application blanks or in other information gathering activities, the major criterion for soliciting candidate information is its relevancy to the job and how it contributes to predicting how well an applicant is likely to perform in that position.

The relevancy of the data collected is the second major criterion which is important in the collection of candidate information. Personnel administrators in school districts need to ask themselves why and for what purposes are applicant background data important? Is it appropriate to collect these data prior to employment? In what way(s) will these data be combined with other information on the candidate? Given that application blanks are low cost, efficient, robust instruments which have high reliability and moderate levels of validity, they warrant much more serious consideration in terms of their potential contribution of relevant verifiable and non-verifiable data to each candidate's application file. If the collection of candidate background is truly for the purpose of being able to predict who is likely to meet school district needs and to perform successfully a particular job, then it is reasonable to expect that information requested is not only job related but that a strong relationship exists between district evaluation criteria, performance level expectations, and information requested.

Based on the three propositions cited by Hough (1984), (past behavior is the best indicator of future behavior, 'samples' of past behavior are preferable to 'signs', and biodata are samples of past behavior and are the best indicators of future behaviors), what are some suggestions for using the standardized application blank more purposefully? Personal identification information is an important area of candidate background information and should obviously be collected for practical reasons. Besides those items, what other information would

be helpful in screening and selecting teachers and administrators? If professional growth and activity beyond classroom/school walls are important , items soliciting membership, levels of participation, responsibilities, and examples of activities in professional organizations would be 'samples' of current and past behavior. If extracurricular activities are an important dimension in the position, questions related to past experiences, interest in, willingness to accept, and special qualifications that would be an asset to the district would provide valuable background data. Another important area cited in the selection of teachers and administrators is the notion of organizational "fit". Knowing what the school district culture is and what its particular needs are, queries about educational philosophy, rationale for choosing teaching as a career, and perceptions about what an ideal learning and working climate would be like, are examples of short answer subjective/reflective response items that could be combined with information from letters of recommendation, interview data, and reference check data.

Issues of legal compliance and information relevancy have implications far beyond application blanks. Sensitivity to possible sources of bias in the multiple activities and stages of candidate selection is important for all personnel decisionmakers. If schools are to meet the challenges of the current educational reform movement, they need the best candidates to fill both professional and nonprofessional positions. Materials and practices which are discriminatory are not only illegal, but when combined with requests for irrelevant candidate information, together they have the potential to compromise a school district's goal of hiring the most capable individuals who have the potential for high quality performance in the organization based on job related experiences.

REFERENCES

Anastasi, A. (1979). Fields of applied of psychology (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Arvey, R.D. & Campion, J.E. (1982). The employment interview: A summary of recent research. Personnel Psychology,, 35, 281-322.

Bredeson, P.V. & Caldwell, Wm. E. (1988). Personnel screening and selection: An analysis of legal compliance in schools., The High School Journal, 71(2), 81-87.

Cascio, W.F. (1978). Applied psychology in personnel management. Reston, VA: Reston Publishing.

Ferguson, L.W. (1961). The development of industrial psychology. In B.H. Gilmer (Ed.), Industrial psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 18-37.

Gorman, C.D., Clover, W.H. & Doherty, M./E. (1978). Can we learn anything about interviewing real people from "interviews" of paper people? Two studies of the external validity of a paradigm. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 22, 165-192.

Guion, R.M. (1965). Personnel testing. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Harris, B.M., McIntyre, K.E., Littleton, V.C. Jr., & Long, D.F. (1985). Personnel Administration in Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Hawley, W. D. (1986). Toward a comprehensive strategy for addressing the teacher shortage. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(10), 712-718.

Hough, L.M. (1984). Development and evaluation of the "accomplishment record" method of selecting and promoting professionals. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69(1), 135-146.

Keating, E., Paterson, D.G., & Stone, C. H. (1950). Validity of work histories obtained by interview. Journal of Applied Psychology, 34, 1-5.

Mayfield, E.C. (1964). The selection interview: A re-evaluation of published research. Personnel Psychology, 17, 239-260.

Mosel, J.L. & Cozan, L.W. (1952). The accuracy of application blank work histories. Journal of Applied Psychology, 36, 365-369.

Nenier, A.G. & Owens, Wm. A. (1982). Relationships between two sets of biodata with 7 years separation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67(2), 146-150.

Owens, Wm. A. (1976). Background data. In Dunnette, M.D. (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and organizational psychology. (pp. 609-644), Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Schmitt, N. (1976). Social and situational determinants of interview decisions: Implications for the employment interview. Personnel Psychology, 29, 79-101.

Shaffer, G.S., Saunders, V. & Owens, Wm. A. (1986). Additional evidence for the accuracy of biographical data: long-term retest and observer ratings. Personnel Psychology, 39, 791-809.

Stone, D.L. & Stone, E. F. (1987). Effects of missing application-blank information on personnel selection decisions: Do privacy strategies bias the outcome? Journal of Applied Psychology, 72(3), 452-456.

Wagner, R. (1949). The employment interview: A critical summary. Personnel Psychology, 2, 17-46.

Wright, O.R. Jr. (1969). Summary of research on the selection interview since 1964. Personnel Psychology, 22, 341-413.

Young, I.P. & Ryerson, D. (I986). Teacher selection: Legal, practical and theoretical aspects. UCEA Monograph Series, Tempe, AR: The University Council for Educational Administration.